PROPOSED FUNDING FORMULA PROGRAM COST COMPARED TO 2007-2008 OPERATING BUDGET PROGRAM COST PLUS EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL Roswell, NM: Group 3

	CARRIZOZO	DORA	ELIDA	FLOYD	FT. SUMNER	GRADY	HONDO	HOUSE	LAKE ARTHUR	MELROSE	TATU
Cost Factor Values	Jennya.	in and	ngomil	entrance (A Contract	Transaction of the same of	1111111111		over all	25025
Fercent Free/Reduced Lunch	74.1%	45.9%	52.9%	70.5%	51.1%	42.4%	87.2%	39.4%	87.7%	42.5%	56.1
Percent English Learners	0.0%	9.4%	0.0%	21.3%	6.5%	0.0%	6.4%	0.8%	18.4%	0.0%	12.5
Percent Special Education (Census based)	16.0%	16.0%	16.0%	16.0%	16.0%	16.0%	16.0%	16.0%	16.0%	16.0%	16.0
Percent Mobility	13.4%	16.9%	8.9%	8.7%	12.5%	18.9%	23.4%	48.1%	29.1%	10.2%	18.1
•Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	24.4%	23.7%	22.6%	28.6%	23.6%	29.3%	24.5%	11.6%	25.3%	20.0%	25.4
*Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	36.6%	28.7%	29.0%	32.2%	29.6%	26.7%	500000000000000000000000000000000000000	71,1%	30.4%	32.0%	34.9
Total District Enrollment	201.0	207.0	139,5	259.0	319.5	136.5	126.5	121.0	156.0	230.0	274.
Individual Formula Adjustments				9							
Student Needs						1			1		
Free/Reduced Lunch	1.231	1,152	1.173	1.222	1.167	1,142	1,265	1.133	1.266	1.142	1.18
English Learners	1.000	1.008	1,000	1.018	1.006	1.000	1.006	1.001	1.016	1.000	1.01
Special Education	1.291	1,291	1.291	1.291	1.291	1.291	1.291	1,291	1.291	1,291	1.29
Mobility	1.024	1.030	1.016	1.016	1.023	1.033	1.041	1.078	1.050	1.019	1.03
Grade Composition	11,200,000	100	00.00000	105010	50,000,000	125127-90	100000	185000	200000	VARIATE.	7-02.0
•Grades 6-8	1.002	1.001	0.998	1.012	1.000	1.014	1.003	0.971	1.004	0.992	1.00
•Grades 9-12	1.018	0.983	0.984	0.999	0.986	0.973	0.983	1,168	0.990	0.997	1.01
Scole (Enrollment)	2000	- SATE	2000	20000	-	3000	565.50		.030005		
*Scale	1.717	1.703	1.902	1.606	1.524	1.914	1.958	1.984	1.842	1.656	1,58
Combined Adjustments											
*Student Needs (all factors multiplied by each other)	1.628	1.546	1.539	1.632	1.551	1.524	1,711	1,578	1.744	1.502	1.59
Student Needs (all factors multiplied by each other) Grade Composition (all factors multiplied by each other)	1.021	0.983	0.982	1.011	0.987	0.987	0.986	1.134	0.995	0.989	1.01
•Scale	1.717	1.703	1,902	1.606	1.524	1.914	1,958	1.984	1.842	1.656	1,58
Overall Adjustment (Combined Student Needs x. Grade		11700	3,7,02	1,000	11024	112.64	1,700	1,704	1,042	1,000	1,50
Composition x Scale)	2.853	2.588	2,875	2.649	2.332	2.878	3.301	3.550	3.196	2.461	2.56
(0) (0) (0)											
Base Per-Pupil Cost	\$5,106	\$5,106	\$5,106	\$5,106	\$5,106	\$5,106	\$5,106	\$5,106	\$5,106	\$5,106	\$5,10
× Overall Adjustment	2.853	2.588	2.875	2.649	2.332	2.878	3.301	3.550	3.196	2.461	2.56
Initial Sufficient Por Pupil Cost	\$14,567	\$13,215	\$14,677	\$13,524	\$11,906	\$14,696	\$16,853	\$18,124	\$16,319	\$12,566	\$13,06
× ISQ Formula Adjustment	1.027	1.056	1.000	1,000	1.045	1.000	1.000	1.000	1,000	1.010	1.08
Final Projected Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$14,957	\$13.953	\$14,677	\$13,524	\$12,444	\$14,696	\$16,853	\$18,124	\$16,319	\$12,690	\$14,20
× Total District Errollment	201.0	207.0	139.5	259.0	319.5	136.5	126.5	121.0	156.0	230.0	274
Final Projected Sufficient Total (Program) Cost	\$3,006,389	\$2.888.353	\$2.047.465	\$3,502.617	\$3,975.698	\$2.006,055	\$2,131,927	\$2,193,030	\$2,545,835	\$2,918,594	\$3.893.35
Actual Program Cost (2007-2008 Operating Budget)	\$2,179,999	\$2,254,355	\$1,425.015	\$2,366,156	\$3,156,737	\$1,448,326	\$1,326,513	\$1,293,322	\$1.628.332	\$2,318,403	\$2,784,18
+ Emergency Supplemental	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$294,808	\$342,290	\$736,153	\$0	\$664,315	\$0	\$2,704,10
2007-2008 Total Program Cost & Emergency Supplemental	\$2,179,999	\$2,254,355	\$1,425.015	\$2,366,156	\$3,451,545	\$1.790.616	\$2,062,667	\$1,293,322	\$2,292,647	\$2,318,403	\$2,784,18
		D 1 or da (0.000 E) (10.00		1					CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR		
Total Marginal Sufficiency Cost – Final Projected Sufficient Total (Program) Cost on line 36 – 2007-2008 Total on line 40	\$826.389	\$633,998	\$622,450	\$1,136,461	\$524,153	\$215,438	\$69,260	\$899,708	\$253,188	\$600,190	\$1,109,16
	22500	2520.000	522.0 WK	120000	20000	3,25-000	Name of the last o	V 232722A	Service system	(00/45/145)	
Percent increase/(Decrease)	37.9%	28.1%	43.7%	48.0%	15.2%	12.0%	3.4%	69.6%	11.0%	25.9%	39.8

1 - Choose District (Use Pull-Down Menu Below) CARRIZOZO

	STEVERSON FOR	W. DOLANDA ST	User Ir	put Cost Fa	ectors	Y.L. MISHES	
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Forollment
User Input Cost Factor Values	74.1%	0.0%	16.0%	13.4%	24.4%	36.6%	201

	SECURE CAPACITY OF STREET	CH-537918	THINK I CAN'T	Cost	Factors	PERSONAL TRANSPORT	Part Control	distance de design	
	(1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1)	Student I	Needs	02E0143		mposition	School School	ale	
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Enrollment- Linear	Enrollment Quadratic	
Coefficients Coefficients	0.375	0.094	1.723	0.190	0.291	0.608	-0.575	0.029	
Transformed Demographic Values	1.741	1.000	1.160	1.134	1.244	1.366	201	1.64.E+12	
Individual Formula Adjustments	1.231	1.000	1.291	1.024	1.002	1.018	1.	717	
Combined Student Needs Adjustment	A CHARLETTER LA	1.62	8		nu Grazala	ACC SEC. 04.577	HALAN DARK	ANTERIOR S	
Combined Grade Composition Adjustment Combined Scale Adjustment	TO STATED ASSESSED	APPRISAL PRO	ARTHUR SER	D'ATERTATION A	1,1	021	特别的特别的	717	
Overall Adjustment (Combined Student Needs/ Grade Composition/Scale)				2.	853				
Base Per-Pupil Cost	\$5,106								
Initial Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$14,567								
ISQ Formula Adjustment	1.027								
Final Projected Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	10 No. 75450-507 All 1910 20 District Annual Confession Annual Con	APPENDED TO THE		\$14	1,957				
Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost	19 (2018) (2018)		PARAMETERS IN	\$3,0	06,389	More had district	E SENTERNE		
Actual Program Cost	50 Date of State of Control	93.897.0023		\$2,1	79,999		are the total of the fo	APROLESSOR	
Emergency Supplemental	ning named and the second			FE ELFAST	\$0	MARINE CO	(BEDUVESTOR)	Sevierona	
Total Marginal Sufficiency Cost (Equals Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost - Actual Program Cost - Emergency Supplemental)	\$826,389								
Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost		VICESTRATE LE	A THE PROPERTY.	\$3,00	06,389	ALMO ESTABLISHED			
Percent Difference Between Actual Program Cost/Emergency Supplemental and Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	37.9%								

1 - Choose District (Use Pull-Down Menu Below) DORA

Security of the second	WATER BOTH TO BE	APRIVATE DE	User Ir	put Cost Fa	ctors	- NASAZ SELENDAS	Tree South No.
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Total District Enrollment
User Input Cost Factor Values	45.9%	9.4%	16.0%	16.9%	23.7%	28.7%	207

	LA LANGE TO LANGE	GUARRIDAER	VFF5scrives: A	Cost	Factors	STATE OF THE PARTY	P. Brich Harb	SET MANUAL PROPERTY.		
	A WATCHESON TO BE	Student I	leeds	ASSET AVAILABLE	Grade Co	mposition	Sc	ale		
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Enrollment- Linear	Enrollment Quadratic		
Coefficients	0.375	0.094	1.723	0.190	0.291	0.608	-0.575	0.029		
Transformed Demographic Values	1.459	1.094	1.160	1.169	1.237	1.287	207	2.24.E+12		
Individual Formula Adjustments	1.152	1.008	1.291	1.030	1.001	0.983	1.7	703		
Combined Student Needs Adjustment	A SECRETARIAN	1.54	6	PINCERWAY	10357313455	OMERIN PRESIDE	rd9tiseti	STATE OF SE		
Combined Grade Composition Adjustment	A TRACCODE AND A	STATISTICS.	A Dec School	AND SERVED	0.9	983	BELLEVILLE COLUMN	TENEDRAM		
Combined Scale Adjustment Overall Adjustment (Combined Student Needs/ Grade Composition/Scale)		2.588								
Base Per-Pupil Cost	\$5,106									
Initial Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$13,215									
ISQ Formula Adjustment	1.056									
Final Projected Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost		es-karron Chia Pallan		\$13	9,953		DOMAN DE LA	e de la companya de		
Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost	R LESSUES CONTROL			\$2,88	88,353	ENGLISH STEEL				
Actual Program Cost				\$2,25	54,355	SECTION OF				
Emergency Supplemental	or prisonancianas	10-15-14-15-1		0/2/07/0	30					
Total Marginal Sufficiency Cost (Equals Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost - Actual Program Cost - Emergency Supplemental)	\$633,998									
Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	\$2,888,353									
Percent Difference Between Actual Program Cost/Emergency Supplemental and Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost				28	.1%					

1 - Choose District (Use Pull-Down Menu Below) ELIDA

	SECOVEROVECELY	HANDEN.	User Ir	put Cost Fa	ctors	A Children in Section 1	MARKET STATES
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Total District Enrollment
User Input Cost Factor Values	52.9%	0.0%	16.0%	8.9%	22.6%	29.0%	140

	A SEMICASE MARKET	CHARLE THE	NAME OF STREET	Cost	Factors	The Control of the Land of the Control of the Contr	BATTER PROPERTY	CONTRACTOR INCOME.	
	A RIPS I CASSANT ST	Student I	Veeds	のこれは新た	Grade Co	mposition	Sc	alo	
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Enrollment- Linear	Enrollment Quadratic	
Coefficients	0.375	0.094	1.723	0.190	0.291	0.608	-0.575	0.029	
Transformed Demographic Values	1.529	1.000	1.160	1.089	1.226	1.290	139.5	3.89.E+10	
Individual Formula Adjustments	1.173	1.000	1.291	1.016	0.998	0.984	1.	902	
Combined Student Needs Adjustment	- Model Control	1.53	9		VENSURE LISTE	CONTRACTOR YES	SCHOOL STREET	10\TE3TE#	
Combined Grade Composition Adjustment	W TANKSTRATERS	2000555	MEST CHANGE	本学的主要的		982	MONTH WELLS	29/35/76/0°/2	
Combined Scale Adjustment	AGENTA PERSONAL	是好的大概的	25.54.547.542.547	NEW MARK	anche an	7110552E4555	1.9	902	
Overall Adjustment (Combined Student Needs/ Grade Composition/Scale)				2.	875				
Base Per-Pupil Cost	\$5,106								
Initial Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$14,677								
ISQ Formula Adjustment	1.000								
Final Projected Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	E REPRESENTATION OF	Jeron Die Pie		\$14	4,677	sa dependa per de la p		naimhleach Ar-Bhaile	
Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost	M BUSSENIESON		V10576V1001694	\$2,0	47,465			Name of Street	
Actual Program Cost	R CONTRACTOR	50/2540/250 10/2540/250		\$1,4	25,015		CONFUSION P		
Emergency Supplemental	10			DOM:	\$0		and the same of th		
Total Marginal Sufficiency Cost (Equals Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost - Actual Program Cost - Emergency Supplemental)	\$622,450								
Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	\$2,047,465								
Percent Difference Between Actual Program Cost/Emergency Supplemental and Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	43.7%								

1 - Choose District (Use Pull-Down Menu Below) FLOYD

	(and a second	THE PARTY	User Ir	put Cost Fa	ctors	NUMBER OF STREET	
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Total District Enrollment
User Input Cost Factor Values	70.5%	21.3%	16.0%	8.7%	28.6%	32.2%	259

	The section of the	270 WHEN HE	Land Land	Cost	Factors	SCHOOL SERVICE	ler winds stre	STATE OF STREET	
	The Indicate Says	Student I	Veeds	akuWntod ()		mposition	Sc	ale	
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Enrollment- Linear	Enrollment- Quadratic	
Coefficients	0.375	0.094	1.723	0.190	0.291	0.608	-0.575	0.029	
Transformed Demographic Values	1.705	1.213	1.160	1.087	1.286	1.322	259	2.57.E+13	
Individual Formula Adjustments	1.222	1.018	1.291	1.016	1.012	0.999	1.6	06	
Combined Student Needs Adjustment	N Table Called	1.63	2		THE PERSON	M-EGS-EN	angrada	A HILLSOME	
Combined Grade Composition Adjustment Combined Scale Adjustment	PU JOSEPH PLANT OF THE			005 (837.414	COLUMN	011	ALC: ALC: ALC: ALC: ALC: ALC: ALC: ALC:	506	
Overall Adjustment (Combined Student Needs/ Grade Composition/Scale)				2.	649				
Base Per-Pupil Cost	\$5,106								
Initial Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$13,524								
ISQ Formula Adjustment	1.000								
Final Projected Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost		Control Control		\$13	3,524				
Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost	N SULLINGUAGE	6,725H 83F 3F 8F		\$3,5	02,617		POTAL BERGUE WASS		
Actual Program Cost	25 (CENTRALISME) 26	Carretae		\$2,3	66,156		USE OF STREET	STEEL STEEL	
Emergency Supplemental					\$0	anthan St			
Total Marginal Sufficiency Cost (Equals Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost - Actual Program Cost - Emergency Supplemental)	\$1,136,461								
Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	Mi Santana San	IN ENCY CLO		\$3,5	02,617		THE STREET FORM		
Percent Difference Between Actual Program Cost/Emergency Supplemental and Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	48.0%								

1 - Choose District (Use Pull-Down Menu Below) FT SUMNER

新元 [1] · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	User Input Cost Factors									
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Total District Enrollment			
User Input Cost Factor Values	51.1%	6.5%	16.0%	12.5%	23.6%	29.6%	320			

	Andrea Property of	SHACKSTON	KNOCKS POEKS	Cost	Factors	Perhantantan da managan		Name of Street		
	CHEMICALE	Student I	Veeds	iss water to	Grade Co	mposition	Sc	alo		
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Enrollment- Linear	Enrollment Quadratic		
Coefficients	0.375	0.094	1,723	0.190	0.291	0.608	-0.575	0.029		
Transformed Demographic Values	1.511	1.065	1.160	1.125	1.236	1.296	319.5	2.77.E+14		
Individual Formula Adjustments	1.167				1.000	0.986	1.1	524		
Combined Student Needs Adjustment	AT PHENDESTRUCK	1.55	1	21-0201-020 31 C-00	9504 W2506	AZBOYSKI KARIZA AKARIZAGANANA				
Combined Grade Composition Adjustment	》种的的动态。	792-W/592-FS	RESERVE CA	OCCUPATION OF THE PARTY OF THE	0.9	987	WAS ALBERTA WARRANT			
Combined Scale Adjustment Overall Adjustment (Combined Student Needs/ Grade Composition/Scale)		2.332								
Base Per-Pupil Cost		\$5,106								
Initial Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$11,906									
ISQ Formula Adjustment	1.045									
Final Projected Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	A CONTRACTOR		PETER WEIGH	\$12	,444			NA CHILLIAN		
Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost		WESTER VALUE		\$3,9	75,698			MANAGEMENTS		
Actual Program Cost				\$3,15	6,737	(CONTRACTOR)		NOTICE SECTION		
Emergency Supplemental	29	BORGONIA CON		\$29	4,808		MERSKER SES			
Total Marginal Sufficiency Cost (Equals Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost - Actual Program Cost - Emergency Supplemental)	\$524,153									
Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	C MANAGEMENT OF THE	95,718,97,732.	ACCEPTANCE OF THE PARTY OF THE	\$3,9	75,698			CATE HAVE A		
Percent Difference Between Actual Program Cost/Emergency Supplemental and Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	15.2%									

1 - Choose District (Use Pull-Down Menu Below) GRADY

	またながらまながらな	THE PARTY OF	User In	put Cost Fa	ctors	がはいるとなっている。	SACRAGA CONTRACTOR
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Forollment
User Input Cost Factor Values	42.4%	0.0%	16.0%	18.9%	29.3%	26.7%	137

	A PERSON SERVICES	Cost Factors									
	STANDARDS -	Student I	Veeds	9.53DL25H2		mposition	Sc	alo			
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Enrollment- Linear	Enrollment- Quadratic			
Coefficients Control of the Control	0.375	0.094	1.723	0.190	0.291	0.608	-0.575	0.029			
Transformed Demographic Values	1,424	1.000	1.160	1.189	1.293	1.267	136.5	3.14.E+10			
Individual Formula Adjustments	1.142	1.000	1.291	1.033	1.014	0.973	1.5	914			
Combined Student Needs Adjustment		1.524									
Combined Grade Composition Adjustment Combined Scale Adjustment	TOTAL PROPERTY OF THE PARTY OF				0.9	987	CHEST PRESUR	Mistant Arkelen			
Overall Adjustment (Combined Student Needs/ Grade Composition/Scale)		2.878									
Base Per-Pupil Cost	\$5,106										
Initial Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$14,696										
ISQ Formula Adjustment	A STANSFORM	PLANCE 2 IS THE		evaluate 1	000	RESONAL SERVICE	DESCRIPTION OF	HEATHRONAU AND			
Final Projected Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	n annesantanten	SHIPMAN		\$14	4,696						
Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost	CO ANTICONOMIA DE NOTA	65-147 E-1479-178-5		\$2,0	06,055	CAP CONTRACTOR					
Actual Program Cost				\$1,4	48,326	ATEXAMENT					
Emergency Supplemental		Barrie Star		\$34	2,290						
Total Marginal Sufficiency Cost (Equals Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost - Actual Program Cost - Emergency Supplemental)	\$215,438										
Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	\$2,006,055										
Percent Difference Between Actual Program Cost/Emergency Supplemental and Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost				12	2.0%						

1 - Choose District (Use Pull-Down Menu Below) HONDO

	User Input Cost Factors									
	Percent Percent Percent Percent Free/Reduced English Special Lunch Learners Education Percent Mobility Grades 6-8 Grades 9-12 Enrollment Share in Share in Grades 6-8 Grades 9-12 Enrollment Share in Share in Share in Grades 9-12 Enrollment Share in									
User Input Cost Factor Values	87.2%	6.4%	16.0%	23.4%	24.5%	28.9%	127			

	E PERSONAL PROPERTY.	Cost Factors Student Needs Grade Composition Sca									
THE COURT OF STREET	S RECUMENTARY	Student I	Needs	Grade Co	mposition	Sc	alo				
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Enrollment- Linear	Enrollmen Quadratic			
Coefficients	0.375	0.094	1.723	0.190	0.291	0.608	-0.575	0.029			
Transformed Demographic Values	1.872	1.064	1.160	1.234	1.245	1.289	126.5	1.49.E+10			
Individual Formula Adjustments	1.265	1.006	1.291	1.041	1.003	0.983	1.5	958			
Combined Student Needs Adjustment		1,71	1		BENEVEL SERVICE		partematica Partematica	ALVERANT SE			
Combined Grade Composition Adjustment	THE RESIDENCE BER	CHARGO SHI	STATE STATE OF STATE	ERMONINE	0.	986	364 D8864E3	WELL-WEALTH			
Combined Scale Adjustment	TOTAL PROPERTY.										
Overall Adjustment (Combined Student Needs/ Grade Composition/Scale)		3.301									
Base Per-Pupil Cost	N SA VAN COLORS	\$5,106									
Initial Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$16,853										
ISQ Formula Adjustment	0 149/8/6-20/6/81		MONNER	1.	000	BIOCLARY ASON	SANGED AT COME	STATE OF			
Final Projected Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost				\$16	3,853						
Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost	d I			\$2,1	31,927		MARKET STATES				
Actual Program Cost			Marke Division	\$1,3	26,513						
Emergency Supplemental	ST CHESTAGE SANGES			\$73	6,153						
Total Marginal Sufficiency Cost (Equals Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost - Actual Program Cost - Emergency Supplemental)	\$69,260										
Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	N BENEAU WALLEY W	\$2,131,927									
Percent Difference Between Actual Program Cost/Emergency Supplemental and Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost		0373100/4/3124		3.	4%						

1 - Choose District (Use Pull-Down Menu Below) HOUSE

	User Input Cost Factors									
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Total District Enrollment			
User Input Cost Factor Values	39.4%	0.8%	16.0%	48.1%	11.6%	71.1%	121			

	Cost Factors Student Needs Grade Composition Sci									
	N SHAMELINE	Student I	Veeds	Grade Co	mposition	Scale				
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Enrollment- Linear	Enrollment Quadratic		
Coefficients	0.375	0.094	1.723	0.190	0.291	0.608	-0.575	0.029		
Transformed Demographic Values	1.394	1.008	1.160	1.481	1.116	1.711	121	9.74.E+09		
Individual Formula Adjustments	1.133	1.001	1.291	1.078	0.971	1.168	1.9	984		
Combined Student Needs Adjustment	AL SINGLE COLUMN	1.57	8	ACHTHUM NO	CHARLESTER	Control Control	STATE OF STA	PERSONAL PROPERTY.		
Combined Grade Composition Adjustment	C. actemications	Tribly bis	CONTROL SELECTION	ONE STATE OF	1.	134	200000000000000000000000000000000000000	SENTENCE SHEET		
Combined Scale Adjustment	WANTED WATER	· 文文文文· 公司· 中国 15、140 127. 伊州· 西田· 中国 14 元 127. 276. 276. 4126. 中国 12 146. 128. 128. 129. 129. 129. 129. 129. 1								
Overall Adjustment (Combined Student Needs/ Grade Composition/Scale)		3.550								
Base Per-Pupil Cost		\$5,106								
Initial Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$18,124									
ISQ Formula Adjustment			USACT-USE PARA	1.	000	Market Cons				
Final Projected Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	Al sessed Assets			\$18	3,124			Merchani		
Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost				\$2,19	93,030	Loca Companyon	110-100-001			
Actual Program Cost	P. Hanzatzzako-alai		TING TING	\$1,20	93,322	and the same				
Emergency Supplemental	CA ROLLY IN LINE TO L				50					
Total Marginal Sufficiency Cost (Equals Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost - Actual Program Cost - Emergency Supplemental)	\$899,708									
Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	\$2,193,030									
Percent Difference Between Actual Program Cost/Emergency Supplemental and Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost				69	.6%					

1 - Choose District (Use Pull-Down Menu Below) LAKE ARTHUR

	User Input Cost Factors									
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Forollment			
User Input Cost Factor Values	87.7%	18.4%	16.0%	29.1%	25.3%	30.4%	156			

	Cost Factors									
图的数 计二字形式 中国全体的学科 不是不是	THE REPORT OF THE PARTY OF	Student I	Veeds	Grade Co	mposition	Sc	ale			
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Enrollment- Linear	Enrollment Quadratic		
Coefficients	0.375	0.094	1.723	0.190	0.291	0.608	-0.575	0.029		
Transformed Demographic Values	1.877	1.184	1.160	1.291	1.253	1.304	156	1.19.E+11		
Individual Formula Adjustments	1.266	1.016	1.291	1.050	1.004	0.990	1.	842		
Combined Student Needs Adjustment	AL COLORS TAKES TAL	1.744 DEGENERAL MARCHINE DE CONTRA D								
Combined Grade Composition Adjustment Combined Scale Adjustment	NAMES OF STREET	0.995								
Overall Adjustment (Combined Student Needs/ Grade Composition/Scale)		3.196								
Base Per-Pupil Cost	(8) Proposition of the control of th	THE PERSON NAMED IN	Street Street	\$5	,106	Physician	CATHELE SPEED	AND STATES		
Initial Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$16,319									
ISQ Formula Adjustment	4. PROLOBETANYOUSE	h-Vallanian		1	000	U 05/7/36/1/19 210/5/2/06/15/2		ELOPACITAD I AS		
Final Projected Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	(2)	NAME OF THE OWNER, OF THE OWNER,		\$16	5,319	COMPANY.	Principles of			
Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost	A	O. A. A.		\$2,5	45,835	GA ASSEVENS				
Actual Program Cost	A CUSTOMORPEANS			\$1,6	28,332			APROLENIATES MEANINESTATE		
Emergency Supplemental	2 GENERALE 2			\$66	4,315	HIMTONIES I				
Total Marginal Sufficiency Cost (Equals Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost - Actual Program Cost - Emergency Supplemental)	\$253,188									
Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	\$2,545,835									
Percent Difference Between Actual Program Cost/Emergency Supplemental and Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost				11	1.0%					

1 - Choose District (Use Pull-Down Menu Below) MELROSE

	THE PROPERTY OF THE	No. of the Control of	User Ir	put Cost Fa	ctors	STATE SALES OF THE	Alexander
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Forollment
User Input Cost Factor Values	42.5%	0.0%	16.0%	10.2%	20.0%	32.0%	230

	2-130-2-12-0	THE PERSON NAMED IN	Participation of the Participa	Cost	Factors	MAKETER	SPATE SERVICE	SALES HISTORY	
	TEATER STATE	Student I	Needs	11.75 W/A2/2016		mposition	Scale		
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Enrollment- Linear	Enrollment- Quadratic	
Coefficients	0.375	0.094	1.723	0.190	0.291	0.608	-0.575	0.029	
Transformed Demographic Values	1,425	1.000	1.160	1.102	1.200	1.320	230	6.97.E+12	
Individual Formula Adjustments	1.142	1.142 1.000 1.291 1.019 0.992 0.997							
Combined Student Needs Adjustment	THE SULFIE AND DE	1.502							
Combined Grade Composition Adjustment Combined Scale Adjustment	THE CORNEL CONTROL CONTROL	ACCUMUSA VA			0.5	989	28.0000000000	356	
Overall Adjustment (Combined Student Needs/ Grade Composition/Scale)	A CONTRACTOR			2.	461				
Base Per-Pupil Cost	A DESIGNATION OF THE RESERVE OF THE	\$5,106							
Initial Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost		\$12,566							
ISQ Formula Adjustment	9 225018A502894	10 22 May 5 59 3	02/3/22/2/4/2/	1.	010	STEEN CLEAN		Part Inpage	
Final Projected Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost			MODELLA CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONT	\$12	2,690	SULTAYON EY	and the same of		
Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost	II EURASS BASSING			\$2,9	18,594	EST DE RANCOUNT	ania in paralella	iaty cristyres	
Actual Program Cost	M CONTRACTOR OF THE CONTRACTOR			\$2,3	18,403			e de la companya della companya della companya de la companya della companya dell	
Emergency Supplemental	7 (246) 229/3336 2				\$0	nizitarestus	Brossessins		
Total Marginal Sufficiency Cost (Equals Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost - Actual Program Cost - Emergency Supplemental)	\$600,190								
Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	\$2,918,594								
Percent Difference Between Actual Program Cost/Emergency Supplemental and Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost				25	5.9%				

1 - Choose District (Use Pull-Down Menu Below) TATUM

的 是不是一个一个一个一个一个一个一个一个一个一个一个一个一个一个一个一个一个一个一	THE PERSONS	STOSEBULSA	User In	put Cost Fa	ctors	Parland Services	Del Zonia
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Forollment
User Input Cost Factor Values	56.1%	12.5%	16.0%	18.1%	25.4%	34.9%	274

	Charles Contract	CHARLENSO	MESTRE DIVINE	Cost	Factors	407778-00-000	Section 2015	Sent Days of	
	Comments of the	Student I	leeds	STURY DIE		mposition	Scale		
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Enrollment- Linear	Enrollment Quadratic	
Coefficients	0.375	0.094	1.723	0.190	0.291	0.608	-0.575	0.029	
Transformed Demographic Values	1.561	1.125	1.160	1.181	1.254	1.349	274	4.82.E+13	
Individual Formula Adjustments	1.182	1.011	1.291	1.032	1.005	1.011	1,5	83	
Combined Student Needs Adjustment	3/ 1/20/20/20/20/20/20/20/20/20/20/20/20/20/	1,593 managana ang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang							
Combined Grade Composition Adjustment Combined Scale Adjustment	一般の表現を表現の表現の表別を表現の表別を表現の表現を表現を表現を表現を表現を表現を表現を表現を表現を表現を表現を表現を表現を表	AP MARKE	MARKANIST CONTRACTOR	CALLEGE SECTION	1.0	015	20/HRADIONE	83	
Overall Adjustment (Combined Student Needs/ Grade Composition/Scale)		2.560							
Base Per-Pupil Cost	\$5,106								
Initial Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$13,069							DEADNING T	
ISQ Formula Adjustment	A PROCESSOR			1.	087	MESCALISEON.	KORYZJERIJE	ASSEMBLE OF	
Final Projected Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost		mestalle)		\$14	,209		STONESTERNOR		
Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost	HEALTH AND THE			\$3,89	93,351	HARTHER THE	MAN TANK SEARCH		
Actual Program Cost	in Alernico Illania IN Educational Residence	**************************************		\$2,78	34,183		Mata https://www.	HUORAIDES	
Emergency Supplemental	Nilstanie iwaz			1901 7 Sept 3	\$0				
Total Marginal Sufficiency Cost (Equals Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost - Actual Program Cost - Emergency Supplemental)	\$1,109,168								
Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	\$3,893,351								
Percent Difference Between Actual Program Cost/Emergency Supplemental and Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost				39	.8%			RACES ACIS	

State of New Mexico LEGISLATIVE EDUCATION STUDY COMMITTEE

REPRESENTATIVES
Rick Miera, Chair
Roberto "Bobby" J. Gonzales
Jimmie C. Hall
Mimi Stewart
Thomas E. Swisstack
W. C. "Dub" Williams

ADVISORY
Ray Begaye
Nathan P. Cote
Nora Espinoza
Mary Helen Garcia
Thomas A. Garcia
Dianne Miller Hamilton
John A. Heaton
Rhonda S. King
Sheryl M. Williams Stapleton
Jim R. Trujillo
Teresa A. Zanetti

State Capitol North, 325 Don Gaspar, Suite 200 Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501 PH: (505) 986-4591 FAX: (505) 986-4338 http://legis.state.nm.us/lcs/lesc/lesc/default.asp



SENATORS
Cynthia Nava, Vice Chair
Vernon D. Asbill
Mary Jane M. Garcia
Gay G. Kernan

ADVISORY
Mark Boitano
Carlos R. Cisneros
Dianna J. Duran
Lynda M. Lovejoy
Mary Kay Papen
John Pinto
William E. Sharer

D. Pauline Rindone, Ph.D., Director Frances R. Maestas, Deputy Director

May 7, 2008

MEMORANDUM

TO: Legislative Education Study Committee

FR: D. Pauline Rindone

RE: PROPOSED FUNDING FORMULA DISCUSSIONS

The agenda for the May LESC meeting includes proposed funding formula calculations of school districts, including committee and group discussions. For your information, attached are the guidelines and questions that were sent to public school district superintendents to facilitate discussions with the committee regarding the impact of the proposed funding formula on school district operations.

State of New Mexico LEGISLATIVE EDUCATION STUDY COMMITTEE

REPRESENTATIVES
Rick Miera, Chair
Roberto "Bobby" J. Gonzales
Jimmie C. Hall
Mimi Stewart
Thomas E. Swisstack
W. C. "Dub" Williams

ADVISORY
Ray Begaye
Nathan P. Cote
Nora Espinoza
Mary Helen Garcia
Thomas A. Garcia
Dianne Miller Hamilton
John A. Heaton
Rhonda S. King
Sheryl M. Williams Stapleton
Jim R. Trujillo
Teresa A. Zanetti

State Capitol North, 325 Don Gaspar, Suite 200 Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501 PH: (505) 986-4591 FAX: (505) 986-4338 http://legis.state.nm.us/lcs/lesc/lesc/default.asp



SENATORS
Cynthia Nava, Vice Chair
Vernon D. Asbill
Mary Jane M. Garcia
Gay G. Kernan

ADVISORY
Mark Boitano
Carlos R. Cisneros
Dianna J. Duran
Lynda M. Lovejoy
Mary Kay Papen
John Pinto
William E. Sharer

D. Pauline Rindone, Ph.D., Director Frances R. Maestas, Deputy Director

May 7, 2008

MEMORANDUM

TO: Public School District Superintendents

FR: D. Pauline Rindone

RE: PROPOSED FUNDING FORMULA DISCUSSIONS

You recently received a memorandum from the Legislative Education Study Committee (LESC) inviting you to work with the committee to examine the potential impact of the new public school funding formula that was proposed during the 2008 legislative session. You should have already received a copy of the LESC agenda for the May meeting that indicates your assigned group.

At the May LESC meeting, LESC staff will present your district's calculator and you will discuss with the committee how the proposed funding formula would affect your school district's operation to accommodate the needs of your students, as well as other issues related to the proposed funding formula. Hard copies of the calculators for the districts in your group will be available for reference and discussion.

In order to facilitate the discussions, LESC staff, with the assistance of the Public Education Department, have prepared the following questions, which will also be provided to the committee. The questions are a guide to assist you in preparing for your discussions with the committee. We understand that you may or may not be able to have complete answers to some of these questions prior to the meeting; however, it is important that we receive written responses to these questions from each of you. If you are not able to respond immediately, please send a copy of your responses to me as soon as you are able to gather the information.

Programs and Services:

- How will the implementation of the proposed funding formula affect your district's program cost? 2. How will the implementation of the proposed funding formula impact the educational programs and student services provided by your district? a) Educational Programs: b) Student Services: 3. Will your district use the additional funding resulting from the implementation of the proposed funding formula to reduce class size? If so, what grades, and how many classrooms would be affected? 4. What other changes might your district consider as a result of additional funding? 5. How will your district ensure that it provides all of the following educational programs and services as required in the funding formula bill, as amended, during the session?
 - bilingual and multicultural education, including culturally relevant learning environments, educational opportunities, and culturally relevant instructional materials;
 - health and wellness, including physical education, athletics, nutrition, and health education;
 - career-technical education;
 - visual and performing arts and music;
 - gifted education, advanced placement, and honors programs;
 - special education; and
 - distance education.

6. To the best of your ability at this time, please fill in the table below to identify the additional state-funded FTE that your district would be able to provide as a result of the implementation of the proposed funding formula:

Personnel	Elementary	Middle	High	Current FTE	Proposed FTE
Teachers					
Principals					
Counselors					
Nurses					
Physical Education Teachers					
Art and Music Teachers					
Social Workers					
Librarians					
Advanced Placement					
Teachers					
Gifted Education					
Intervention Specialists					
Bilingual Education					
Educational Assistants					
Special Education Teachers					
(excluding gifted)					
Ancillary and Support Staff					
Maintenance and Operations					
Staff (including custodians)					
Data Entry Clerks					
Other Central Office Staff					
Other School-based Staff					

Staff Salaries:

The proposed funding formula would replace the current Training and Experience (T&E) Index with the Index of Staff Qualifications (ISQ). Although both indexes are designed to distribute additional funding to districts and charter schools based on the composition of their instructional staff, they are not identical:

- The T&E calculation is based on years of service and academic degrees for all instructional staff but does not reflect the three-tiered licensure system for teachers.
- The ISQ calculation recognizes not only experience and academic degrees but also licensure levels. It was calibrated on the average teacher salaries for each of the three levels and distributes additional dollars based on the proportion of teachers in each of those levels. In addition, there is a second calculation for those instructional staff, such as counselors, who are not included in the three-tiered system. Because the base per-student cost upon which the proposed formula is based already reflects the average salary by personnel category in the average district, the ISQ is applied only to salary costs in a district or charter school that are beyond the average.
- 7. If you have calculated your district's ISQ using the most recent matrices in the bill (see attachment), how would this factor impact funding for your district?

Special Education:

8.		lents in your district have been identified as in need of special entage of your district's enrollment does this number represent? udents.)
	Number:	Percentage:%

9. How will the proposed funding formula's utilization of a fixed special education identification rate of 16 percent impact special education funding for your district?

Gifted Education:

10.	Currently, how many s percentage of your dist	•		dentified as gifted, and what represent?	t
	Number:	_	Percentage:	%	
11.	students that have been	identified as gints be served.	fted to be in need of	not require districts to consider of special education, it does rict specifically address the	
Rev	enue Sources for Imple	mentation:			
12.	What revenue sources a district support?	for the additions	al dollars needed to	reach sufficiency would you	ur
Pote	ential Problems:				
13.	What problems, if any, the proposed funding for	•	ict anticipate will a	rise from the implementation	n of
14.	What problems, if any, formula is not implement	•	ict anticipate will a	rise if the proposed funding	
15.	Please feel free to identhat you feel the comm	•		oeen addressed in these ques	stions
xc:	Legislative Education	n Study Commi	ttee		

ISQ-A - Teachers, Including Librarians

						Level							
Years Within Level	0 – 1			2-3	L	4-5						Total	Total
Academic Classification	FTE Factor Adjusted FTE	sted FTE	FTE	Factor Adjusted FTE	TE FTE	Factor Adjusted FTE	III.					FTE /	Adjusted FTE
Bachelor's	0.64	0.00		0.67 0.0	00.0		8			JE ST		0.00	0.00
Master's	0.68	0.00		0.72 0.0	00.0	0.76 0.	0.00					0.00	0.00
Master's + 45/Post-Masters	0.71	0.00		0.75 0.0	00		8					0.00	0.00
Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.00 0.00		00.0					0.00	0.00
						Level II							
Years Within Level	4-6			7 – 8		9 – 15		Over 15				Total	Total
Academic Classification	FTE Factor Adjusted FTE	sted FTE	FTE	Factor Adjusted FTE	TE FTE	Factor Adjusted FTE	TE FTE	E Factor Adjusted FTE	sted FTE			FTE /	Adjusted FTE
Bachelor's	0.76	0.00		0.82 0.0	00.0		8	1.04	0.00			0.00	0.00
Master's	0.81	0.00		0.88 0.0	90	1.00	0.00	1.11	0.00			0.00	0.00
Master's + 45/Post-Masters	0.85	0.00			00.00		8	1.16	0.00			0.00	0.00
Total	0.00	00.0	0.00	0.0	0.00 00.00		0.00	0.00	0.00		12223	0.00	0.00
						Level III							
Years Within Level	7 – 8	_		9 – 15		Over 15						Total	Total
Academic Classification	FTE Factor Adjusted FTE	sted FTE	FTE	Factor Adjusted FTE	TE FTE	Factor Adjusted FTE						FTE /	Adjusted FTE
Bachelor's	06:0	0.00		1.02 0.0	00.0	1.17 0.	00.0					0.00	0.00
Master's	0.96	0.00		1.09 0.0	00.0	1.25 0.	00.0					0.00	0.00
Master's + 45/Post-Masters	1.01	0.00		1.14 0.0	00	1.31 0.	00					0.00	0.00
Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.00 00.00		0.00					0.00	0.00
										Ma	Matrix Totals	0.00	00:00

ISQ-B - Other Instructional Staff

Years of Experience	0-2	.2	e	3-5	u	8-9		9 – 15		Over 15		Total	Total
Academic Classification	FTE Factor	FTE Factor Adjusted FTE FTE Factor Adju	FTE Fact	or Adjusted FTE	FTE Fact	Factor Adjusted FTE	d ald	Factor Adjusted FTE	FTE FTE	Factor Adjusted FTE	sted FTE	FTE	Adjusted FTE
Bachelor's or Less	0.65	00.00	0.78	00:00	8.0	37 0.00			00.0	0.91	0.00	0.00	00.0
Bachelor's + 15	0.70	0.00	0.83		9.0			0.96.0	00.	1.00	00.0	0.00	00.0
Master's/Bachelor's + 45	0.74	0.00	0.87	00.00	0.91	91 0.00			00.0	1.04	0.00	0.00	00:00
Master's + 15	0.78	0.00	0.91	0.00	5.1			1.13 0	00.	1.17	0.00	0.00	00.0
Master's + 45/Post-Masters	0.87	0.00	1.00	00.00	1.13	13 0.00		1.22 0	00.0	1.30	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	00.0	0.00	0.00	00:00	0.00	00:00	0.00	0	0.00 0.00		0.00	0.00	00:00
										Matr	Matrix Totals	0.00	00.0

GRAND TOTAL (ISQ-A+ISQ-B) 0.00 0.00 index of staff qualifications #DIV/0!